

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,798 to Albers, et al. ("*Albers*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0190689 to Benitez Pelaez, et al. ("*Pelaez*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As previously argued, the proposed *Albers-Pelaez* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 1. Specifically, Applicant contends that the proposed *Albers-Pelaez* combination fails to disclose "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node for each new session that is transported through the node." This is because, the cited portion of *Albers* does not indicate that the number of interface modules, the number of interface units, or specifically the number of interface units that connect to an enforcement agency terminal are dependent on the number of sessions transported through the 5ess switch. Instead, Albers indicates only that "[t]he interface modules 51 each include a number of interface units 0 to n." *Albers*, col. 10, ll. 14-15. Thus, the cited portion of *Albers* does not disclose "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node for each new session that is transported through the node" (emphasis added) as recited by Claim 1.

In response, the Examiner states that, "[a]s claimed, there is no requirement that such 'extra port[s]' be such that their number is 'dependent on the number of sessions transported through' the node; in fact, there is no requirement that such 'extra ports' are distinct or unique for each session." *Office Action*, p. 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees, as one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the plain meaning of the claim language to require a different extra port assigned for each new session.

However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant has made certain clarifying amendments to independent Claims 1 and 5 so that they specifically recite "each extra port corresponding to a particular new session." Therefore, for the same reasons discussed before, *Albers* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node of an internet protocol multimedia subsystem domain for each new session that is transported through the node, each extra port corresponding to a particular new session." *Benitez-Pelaez* fails to cure these deficiencies.

As a result, the proposed *Albers-Benitez-Pelaez* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of amended Claim 1. Although of differing scope from Claim 1, amended Claim 5 includes elements that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references at least for analogous reasons to those discussed with respect to Claim 1. Claims 1 and 5 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1 and 5, and their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian M. Kearns, Reg#62287/

Brian M. Kearns
Registration No. 62,287

Date: March 24, 2011

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-9447
brian.kearns@ericsson.com